

Mark D. Eibert (Bar # 116570)
 Attorney at Law
 P. O. Box 1126
 Half Moon Bay, CA 94019-1126
 Telephone: (650) 638-2380
 Fax: (650) 712-8377

Attorney for: Defendant Daniel Rangel

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

DANIEL RANGEL,

Defendant.

CR NO. 07-00788 JF (NC)

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR EXTENSION
 OF TIME TO FILE TWO PAGE LETTER
 BRIEF RE OUTSTANDING DISCOVERY
 ISSUES, AND

~~[PROPOSED]~~ ORDER THEREFORE

On February 23, 2012, the Court issued an Order setting a variety of dates for case management purposes. One of the items in this Order stated that “on March 7, 2012, Defendants may file a two-page letter brief raising any outstanding discovery issues. The government may file a two-page letter brief in response on March 14, 2012. No reply brief shall be filed.” Docket # 442. The next date after that is the status conference and hearing on motion to dismiss set for March 21.

Undersigned counsel was under the mistaken impression that the March 7 date had been moved along with and in tandem with the movement of other motions dates. In addition, there has been a considerable amount of paper and electronic discovery produced immediately before and also after the last hearing, up to and including the voluntary and cooperative production by

1 the government just today (March 7) of one of the previously disputed items I had requested. I
2 am not sure how many, if any, discovery issues remain outstanding between the government and
3 Mr. Rangel, and it is quite possible that there are none. However, in order to be certain I need
4 more time to review the discovery I have received since the last hearing and discuss it with the
5 government. Additionally, yesterday and today I was in Pasadena for an oral argument in a
6 Ninth Circuit case (Flournoy v. Small), and was unable to work on this matter.

7 Accordingly, I respectfully request an extension of time to file a letter brief of up to two
8 pages from Wednesday March 7 to Monday, March 12. Similarly, I request that the deadline for
9 the government to respond be extended to March 19. No replies would be allowed. This would
10 still have such matters, if any, brought to the Court's attention two days prior to the upcoming
11 hearing.

12 The prosecutor, Mr. Nedrow, has graciously indicated that he has no objection to this
13 request.

14 A proposed Order is below.

15 March 7, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

16 /s/ Mark D. Eibert

17 Mark D. Eibert


18 Attorney for Defendant Daniel Rangel
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ORDER

Good cause appearing therefore, it is hereby ORDERED that defendant Daniel Rangel shall have until March 12, 2012 to file a a letter brief not to exceed two pages raising any outstanding discovery issues. The government may file a two-page letter brief in response by March 19. No reply brief shall be filed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 9, 2012


HON. LUCY H. KOH
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE